REMARKS

Claims 1-15, 17-19, 21 and 22 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 10, 15, 17, 19, 21 have been amended while claims 16 and 20 have been canceled as shown on pages 2-7 of the Reply. In addition, new claim 22 is added. Support for the amendments can be found in the specification as filed at, for example, paragraphs [0047-0048] and [0054-0055]

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I.   Rejection of Claims 1, 3, 6-10, and 12 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

Claims 1, 3, 6-10, and 12 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Kenyon et al. (US 6,792,430). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Kenyon *et al.* fails to teach or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

> A single prior art reference anticipates a patent claim only if it ***expressly or inherently describes each and every limitation*** set forth in the patent claim. *Trintec Industries, Inc. v. Top-U.S.A. Corp.*, 295 F.3d 1292, 63 USPQ2d 1597 (Fed. Cir. 2002); *See Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). ***The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim***. *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

Applicant's claimed subject matter teaches a method of sharing computer objects between different computer spaces and forming new associations between a shared object and objects existing in a computer where the shared object is moved into. To this end, independent claim 1 recites: ***sharing the selected object and the association information from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including one or more second objects that match the one or more first objects; identifying the one or more second objects in the second computer space; and automatically forming one or more associations between the selected object and the second objects preexisting in the second computer space upon the sharing of the selected object and the association information from the first computer space to the second computer space.*** Similarly, independent claim 10 recites:

instructions for sharing the selected object and the stored association information from the first computer space with a second computer space, the second computer space including one or more second objects that are respectively identical to one or more of the first objects; instructions for identifying in the second computer space the one or more first second objects; and instructions for automatically creating one or more associations between the selected object and the one or more second objects in the second computer space. Kenyon *et al.* fails to teach or suggest such claim elements.

Kenyon *et al.* provides for a method of generating a navigational model for linking together information objects on an existing information space. The overlay includes concept nodes expressing concepts. If a digital information object is encountered, it is examined to determine if it has at least one concept in common with concepts expressed in concept nodes. If yes, then the digital information object is automatically and dynamically linked to each concept node expressing common concepts. (*See* Kenyon *et al.* Abstract). Kenyon *et al.* also teaches that the overlay can be shared between users/computers. On page 3 of the subject Final Office Action, it is contended that in teaching the sharing of the overlay, Kenyon *et al.* teaches the claimed aspects. However, as taught by Kenyon *et al.* the overlay consists of linked network of concept and information objects that reflect the user's interest in a given area (*See* Kenyon *et al.* col.3 lines 31-35). Thus, in accordance with Kenyon *et al.*, when an over lay is shared/transferred between computer spaces, it implies that the information objects and associations contained in the overlay are also transferred from one computer space to the other. Although Kenyon *et al.*, discloses that there is no replication of information, nowhere does it teach or suggest *the second computer space including one or more second objects that match the one or more first objects.* Further, the system of Kenyon *et al.*, does not execute the step of *identifying the one or more second objects in the second computer space* nor does it teach or suggest *automatically forming one or more associations between the selected object and the second objects preexisting in the second computer space upon the sharing of the selected object and the association information from the first computer space to the second computer space.*

From the foregoing, it is clear that an identical invention as recited in the subject claims is not disclosed or suggested by Kenyon *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection

with respect to independent claims 1, and 10 (and the claims that depend there from) should be withdrawn.

II.   Rejection of Claims 2, 5, 11, and 14 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 2, 5, 11, and 14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon et al. (US 6,792,430 B1) in view of Batty et al. (US 6,223,212 B1). Claims 2, 5, 11 and 14 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed *supra*, Kenyon *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 1 and 10. Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

III.   Rejection of Claims 4 and 13 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 4 and 13 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon et al. (US 6,792,430 B1) in view of Batty et al. (US 6,223,212) as applied to claims 3 and 12, and further in view of Hatori (US 2003/00221122). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Kenyon *et al.*, Batty *et al.* and Hatori *et al.* fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Claims 4 and 13 respectively depend from independent claims 1 and 10. As discussed *supra*, Kenyon *et al.* fails to disclose or suggest all features of amended independent claims 1 and 10. Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* Hatori relates to a computer enhancing a security level when connecting to a network, and fails to compensate for the deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* and Batty *et al.* Additionally, it is erroneously contended on page 9 of the Final Office Action dated October 3, 2008 that Hatori discloses a file sharing device. However, at the cited portion Hatori teaches a simple file download/execution on/off switching device that enables or disables download of files via a network based on a user specification or on security information related to the network recognized by a network recognition device. Hatori fails to teach or suggest ***automatically forming one or more associations between the selected object and the second objects preexisting in the second computer space upon the sharing of the selected object and the***

association information from the first computer space to the second computer space.
as recited in independent claims 1 and 10. Such functionality allows a shared object to be used in the second computer space with the same association-based functionality as in the first computer space including association –based security, association-based linking of related object, association –based accessing of objects etc. (*See* applicant's specification as filed paragraph [0050]). Such aspects are neither suggested nor taught either alone or in combination by the cited documents. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

IV.   Rejection of Claims 15-17 and 19-21 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claims 15-17 and 19-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon, *et al.* (US 6,792,430) in view of Hatori (US 2003/00221122). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for at least the following reasons. Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori fail to disclose or suggest each and every element of the subject claims.

Independent claim 15 recites: ***determining an extent of the association of the selected object with the second computer space and permitting sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if it is determined that the extend of association of the selected object with the second computer space is greater than a predetermined threshold; and interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.*** Similarly, independent claim 19 recites: ***instructions for determining whether the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than a predetermined threshold; instructions for permitting sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if it is determined that the association of the selected object with the second computer space is of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold; and instructions for interfering with the sharing of the selected object with the second computer space if the association of the selected object with the second computer space is not of an extent greater than the predetermined threshold.*** As conceded on page 8 of the Final Office Action dated October 3, 2008, Kenyon, *et al.* does not disclose the aforementioned aspects of independent claims 15 and 19. Hatori fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiency.

Hatori relates to a computer apparatus that sets security information in association with a network connection to be used. Based on stored security information, it disables processes that can be executed by other networked computers. At the cited portion, it also provides for restarting a terminated process. (paragraphs [0013] and [0021]). On page 9 of the Final Office Action dated October 3, 2008, it is erroneously contended that Hatori teaches comparing association information of an object and a second computer space with a predetermined threshold. Rather, Hatori teaches a security setting parameter for a network which is an attribute of the network rather than the object that is exchanged in a process with the network. This is not the same as association information between a specific object and a second computer space that receives the object. In accordance with the claimed subject matter, an extent of association is determined between the object to be shared and the computer space the object is to be shared with. For example, an extent of association can be determined between one or more objects and one or more users of the second computer space as further recited in new dependent claim 22. Thus, for users who may have strong association with the object(s), such as because they have created or received them previously, the system would permit sharing the object(s) with such users. (*See* applicant's specification as filed paragraph [0053-0055]). The cited art does not teach or suggest such claimed aspects.

In view of at least the aforementioned it is clear that Kenyon, *et al.* in view of Hatori fails to render independent claims 15, 19 obvious. Hence, this rejections should be withdrawn with respect to these claims and all claims that depend there from.

V.   Rejection of Claim 18 Under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Claim 18 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kenyon et al. in view of Hatori and further in view of Batty *et al.* (US 6,223,212 B1). Withdrawal of this rejection is requested for the following reasons. Claim 18 depends from independent claims 15. As discussed *supra*, Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori, alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest all features of independent claim 15. Batty *et al.* relates to techniques for coordinating the sharing of an application with multiple computer systems, and fails to make up for the aforementioned deficiencies of Kenyon *et al.* and Hatori. Accordingly, it is requested that this rejection be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063 [MSFTP685US].

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP

 /Bhavani S. Rayaprolu/
Bhavani S. Rayaprolu
Reg. No. 56,583

AMIN, TUROCY & CALVIN, LLP
57TH Floor, Key Tower
127 Public Square
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
Telephone (216) 696-8730
Facsimile (216) 696-8731